

Submitter Info.txt

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Developing an Unified Intercarrier Compensation:=====

Title: Developing an Unified Intercarrier Compensation

FR Document Number: 2011-04399

Legacy Document ID:

RIN:

Publish Date: 3/2/2011 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Margaret

Last Name: Glaser

Mailing Address: 2416 W. Greenleaf

City: Chicago

Country: United States

State or Province: IL

Postal Code: 60645

Organization Name: null

See attached file(s)

Please see the attached file for my comment on why I believe phone landlines should continue to be supported.

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Connect America Fund)	WC Docket No. 10-90
)	
A National Broadband Plan for Our Future)	GN Docket No. 09-51
)	
Establishing Just and Reasonable Rates for Local Exchange Carriers)	WC Docket No. 07-135
)	
High-Cost Universal Service Support)	WC Docket No. 05-337
)	
Developing an Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime)	CC Docket No. 01-92
)	
Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service)	CC Docket No. 96-45
)	
Lifeline and Link-Up)	WC Docket No. 03-109
)	
)	

To: Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

Comment Filed by:

Margaret M. Glaser
2416 W. Greenleaf #3
Chicago, IL 60645
e-mail: mm.glaser@yahoo.com

Date filed: April 12, 2011

KEEP WIRED LANDLINE PHONES

I am very concerned about the FCC proposal to eliminate many telephone landlines. It appears to be the next phase of the ongoing, indiscriminate proliferation of wireless

technologies, and the associated radiation to which all are now being subjected involuntarily. There is no way to escape exposure to the ever-increasing levels of this radiation, and elimination of landline phones will greatly exacerbate the problem. This is especially true for those who are particularly sensitive to this biologically active agent.

I don't know how much the members of the FCC actually know about the bioeffects research firsthand. Having tracked it for 11 years, it seems unbelievable to me that an agency so responsible for expanding exposure to the public and environment can avoid seeing the hints of potential harm that are apparent in the great majority of non-industry sponsored research (and in 1/3 of the industry sponsored research). There must be a very strong bias pushing the FCC in the direction it has gone in heretofore. Of course, the most obvious culprit is the close connection with the telecom industry.

A number of senior scientists in the health agencies upon which the FCC purports to rely have expressed serious concerns over the years about the actual safety of wireless radiation at levels currently allowed by FCC guidelines. The European Union's Environmental Agency has expressed concern, as have several individual governments in Europe and elsewhere.

I have personally sat on the IEEE subcommittee, SC4, that recommends RF safety standards to the FCC. It is clear that this is anything but an open-minded group. It is riddled with conflicts of interest, most of its members being positioned to profit from the expansion of wireless telecommunications and other wireless. Complaint was filed with the IEEE Ethics Committee during the development of the standard, but nothing was done to address these problems. This august group representing the mobile manufacturers of the world continually tells the public that "more research is needed," and yet at their meetings, and in personal communications with me, they say that the research needs to stop. This is because they, in their biased wisdom, are certain that no problem exists and that all the research showing bioeffects at low levels is "junk science." Unfortunately, no one overseeing them has looked into the science to see if their position has merit. Meanwhile, their influence on other "authoritative" groups insures the appearance of support, while it is merely the left hand agreeing with the right.

There are many reasons to continue to support landlines in the US. They are more secure, more private, more reliable, more affordable, and easier to use. The overriding reason for me, however, is that we know wired landlines are safe. We do not know that mobile phones are safe, and in fact, there are many studies suggesting they may not be. Taking away the rights of individuals to decide whether they wish expose themselves and their children to this near-field radiation exposure, and risk the bioeffects seen in so many studies, is like requiring them to engage in a habit like cigarette smoking every day of their life. Such a situation would be intolerable.

Something you do not hear much about in the US (and let's face it, you hear very little about this whole issue in this country compared to others) is the problem of hypersensitivity to non-ionizing radiation at levels lower than FCC limits. Several studies have concurred that at least 2% of the population at large is hypersensitive to it.

In recent years, the percentage has doubled in Sweden and Germany where it has been studied. I've met some of these people—a teenager who, to her dismay, noticed that she got bad headaches when she did not use a wired headset with her cell phone; a senior congressional aide who relayed the same thing and who was stymied when he tried to report it to his telecom and found no one was interested or collecting the information; a middle aged woman in an electric wheelchair who said she got nosebleeds whenever she used a cell phone; a businessman who reported that he got face and neck burning on the side of his head where and when he used his cell phone. These were not psych cases. As a professional who does psychological assessments for a living, I have a pretty good sense about who has got their feet on the ground. I believe the FCC would know a great deal more about this hypersensitivity if the Commission actively sought feedback about it from the public. However, the FCC seems more interested in accommodating the wireless industry than in making sure the public is truly protected.

So far, Congress, too, has done more to make the country safe for the wireless industry than to make it safe for people. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 took away the rights of communities to make siting decisions on cell towers that might better protect the environment and the people in it. Animal populations, too, like birds, frogs and bees may be at risk. This seems to be of no consequence to the FCC and the Congress. It appears that decisions were made a long time ago on what was going to be important, and ever since, the truth has been bent to fit the priorities.

I have a wired landline, and I rely on it. I do not have any wish to take the radiation risks associated with using a home cell phone, and I would consider it a violation of my home and my health were I forced into it. For the safety and security of all, please keep the landline system going.

Sincerely,
Margaret M. Glaser

Please Do Not Reply To This Email.

Public Comments on Developing an Unified Intercarrier Compensation:=====

Title: Developing an Unified Intercarrier Compensation

FR Document Number: 2011-04399

Legacy Document ID:

RIN:

Publish Date: 3/2/2011 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Katie

Last Name: Alvord

Mailing Address: PO Box 516

City: Houghton

Country: United States

State or Province: MI

Postal Code: 49931

Organization Name: null

See attached file - in brief, I have two main comments re this proposal:

1.The analog circuit-switched telephone network must be maintained to provide universal phone service, especially because many electrically sensitive people are unable to use anything else.

Our household is one of many that continues to rely on an analog landline. We CANNOT use cell phones, digitized phones, or wireless technologies because my husband has multiple chemical sensitivities as well as electrical sensitivities. He is unable to stand even within a few feet of a cell phone without experiencing symptoms, and is also limited as to how much he can use a computer. He relies heavily on an analog landline, and we know others like him.

Figures from the ADA Access Board suggest that 10 million Americans might be similarly electrically sensitive. Phasing out analog landlines would thus create a large new class of telecomm-unserved Americans. To prevent this from happening, and to continue universal phone service, you must continue to maintain the analog circuit-switched telephone network.

2.Any public funds directed to broadband should go only to fixed fiber-optic installations and not to wireless networks, for reasons of economy, national security, and public health.

I support using fiber optics instead of wireless for at least the following reasons:

- Fiber-optic cable is more cost-effective.
- Fiber-optic cable is less subject to security disruptions than wireless networks.
- Fiber-optic cable is superior for public health reasons. A growing body of evidence suggests that wireless technologies affect physiology and health. Continuing to expand wireless despite such findings risks public health.

Again, I urge you:

1. To maintain universal phone service, you must maintain the analog circuit-switched telephone system.
2. For better economy, national security, and public health, direct any public funds for broadband to fiber-optics, NOT to wireless.

Thank you.

To the FCC:

I write regarding your proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund, to express my support for use of fiber-optics as opposed to wireless broadband, and especially to urge you to continue maintaining the analog circuit-switched telephone network. I have two main comments in response to this proposed rulemaking:

1.The analog circuit-switched telephone network must be maintained as part of providing universal phone service, for several reasons but especially because many electrically sensitive individuals are physically unable to use anything else.

Our household is one of many that continues to rely on an analog landline. We CANNOT use cell phones, digitized phones, or wireless technologies in our home because my husband has been diagnosed with multiple chemical sensitivities as well as electrical sensitivities. He is unable to stand even within a few feet of a cell phone without experiencing symptoms, and is also limited as to how much he can use a computer. For his own independence, he relies heavily on an analog landline, and we know many others like him.

The ADA Access Board cites figures suggesting that 10 million Americans might be similarly electrically sensitive. Many if not all of these people are, like my spouse, unable to use wireless or digital phone service or computers. Like us, they rely on the analog circuit-switched phone network of traditional landlines for most if not all of their telecommunications needs. In addition, I understand that some people with medical implants use traditional landlines because cell phones sometimes interfere with the operation of their implants.

Phasing out the switched phone network would thus create a large new class of telecomm-unserved Americans. To prevent this from happening, and to continue the standard of universal telephone service, you must continue to maintain the analog circuit-switched telephone network – for our household and for others like us.

Our analog network of traditional landlines also continues to play an important communications role for the general public. These landlines continue to be important in emergencies; when the power grid goes down, cellphone service can be disrupted while traditional circuit-switched landlines continue to operate. Weakening or eliminating the traditional landline system could thus create communication gaps that could risk public safety; maintaining the landline network gives us a better overall public safety communications system.

2.Any public funds directed to broadband as part of this rulemaking should go only to fixed fiber-optic installations and not to wireless networks, for reasons of economy, national security, and public health.

In general, the wireless industry is booming and does not need additional money from the government. In cases such as underserved rural areas where the government determines

that some sort of public funding is necessary, I support using fiber optics instead of wireless for at least the following reasons:

1-Fiber-optic cable is more cost-effective especially in the long run because its greater capacity means it does not become obsolete as quickly as wireless, and it does not need frequent replacement. I also understand that it needs less maintenance.

2-Fiber-optic cable is better for national security as it is less subject to disruption than wireless networks. As noted by the Coalition for Local Oversight of Utility Technologies (CLOUT), wireless networks are vulnerable to hacking wherever a potential cyber-terrorist can pick up a signal. Fiber-optics do not have this same level of vulnerability.

3-Fiber-optic cable is superior for public health reasons. Not only does it have less effect on the electrically sensitive, but there is a growing body of evidence suggesting that wireless technologies affect the physiology of all living cells, including those in the human nervous system. For instance, earlier this year a highly-respected study appearing in the Journal of the American Medical Association found that cell phones accelerate glucose metabolism in brain cells. Previous studies have found that wireless frequencies can increase permeability of the blood-brain barrier, allowing potentially damaging large proteins into the brain; break DNA strands; alter white blood cell activity in schoolchildren; reduce sperm quality; increase the risk of acoustic neuromas; increase the risk of salivary gland tumors; and have other effects too numerous to list here.

Continuing to expand the wireless network in the face of such scientific findings risks a potentially significant deterioration of public health.

Again, I urge you:

1. To maintain universal phone service, you must maintain the analog circuit-switched telephone system.
2. For better economy, national security, and public health, direct any public funds for broadband to fiber-optic installations, and not to wireless.

Thank you for your consideration. I would appreciate being added to your notification list. I can be reached at ktalvord@gmail.com via my dial-up service accessed over an analog phone line, as well as via postal mail.

Sincerely,

Katie Alvord